

Centrify Corporation,)	No. 4:10-cv-3873-CW (filed Aug. 30, 2010)
)	
<i>Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant,</i>)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
Quest Software, Inc.,)	
)	
<i>Defendant and Counterclaim-Plaintiff.</i>)	
<hr/>)	
Centrify Corporation,)	No. 4:11-cv-4675-CW (filed Sept. 20, 2011)
)	(related case)
<i>Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant,</i>)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
Quest Software, Inc.,)	
)	
<i>Defendant and Counterclaim-Plaintiff.</i>)	
)	

To promote efficiency for the Parties and Court, Quest Software, Inc. and Centrifify Corporation hereby agree and stipulate that Civil Action No. 4:10-cv-3873-CW and Civil Action No. 4:11-cv-4675-CW shall be stayed effective immediately; and

1. The Conclusion of Reexamination-Related Appeals in Both Reexaminations: Decision of all reexamination-related appeals by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in Application No. 95/001,458 (concerning U.S. Patent No. 7,617,501) and Application No. 95/001,434 (concerning U.S. Patent No. 7,591,005); or

2. The Conclusion of Reexamination-Related Appeal in Either Reexamination: If appeals to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences are taken in one, but not both

of Application No. 95/001,458 and Application No. 95/001,434, decision of all reexamination-related appeals by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in the appealed case; or

3. The Deadline to File an Appeal When None Filed in Either Case: The deadline for the Parties to file appeals to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences passing in both Application No. 95/001,458 and Application No. 95/001,434 without an appeal being timely filed in either case.

Dated: December 22, 2011

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

COOLEY LLP

/s/ Ryan Sandrock

/s/ Orion Armon

Ryan Sandrock
Attorneys for Centrifry Corp.

Orion Armon
Attorneys for Quest Software, Inc.

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION IT IS SO ORDERED:

Dated: 12/23/2011


The Honorable Claudia Wilken
United States District Judge